

**REMARKS**

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's attention to this application. The Office Action indicates that claims 22-25 are allowed, and claims 2-11, 13-21, and 26-27 would be allowed if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Office Action also rejects claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

This response amends claims 1, 3, 12, and 26. The amendments to claims 12 and 26 correct minor informalities or clerical errors. The amendments to claims 1 and 3 are discussed below. Claims 1-27 remain pending.

**Argument:**

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent no. 6,047,103 to Kazuhiko Yamauchi et al. (hereinafter "Yamauchi") in view of U.S. patent no. 5,353,353 to Nader Vijeh et al. (hereinafter "Vijeh"). As indicated below, Applicants respectfully traverse those rejections. Furthermore, in order to reduce the delays, expenses, and arguments necessary to obtain protection for applicants' invention, this response amends claim 1 to include features from claim 3.

Claims 1 and 12 pertain to methods for authenticating both video sink devices and video repeater devices in a hierarchy of video devices. By contrast, Yamauchi only provides for authentication between video source devices and video sink devices. For instance, as recognized in the Office Action, Yamauchi does not disclose authenticating a video sink device with a video repeater device.

The Office Action asserts that Vijeh discloses this limitation in column 3, lines 5-10, and column 4, lines 57-67. Applicants respectfully traverse that assertion.

Vijeh pertains to “a system for providing secure communications in a LAN network that utilizes multiport repeaters” (col. 4, lines 4-6). Specifically, the system of Vijeh provides security by using “a jamming sequence to prevent unauthorized ports from receiving certain data” (Abstract). In particular, Vijeh teaches that “security … is provided by monitoring the destination field upon receiving a message from a port,” producing “a disrupt mask” based on parameters such as “whether there is a destination address/source address match,” and providing the disrupt mask to the repeater, which uses the mask “to selectively pass the message unmodified or disrupt the message depending upon the pattern.” The portions of Vijeh cited in the Office Action merely disclose repeaters that feature multiple ports, that provide “the basic repeater function, performing signal amplitude and timing restoration,” and that can “detect and interpret data and fields within” a signal. Vijeh says nothing about authenticating a video repeater device with a video source device. Vijeh also says nothing about authenticating a video sink device with a video repeater device.

Consequently, even if Yamauchi and Vijeh were to be combined, the combination would not disclose or suggest “authenticating the first video repeater device to the video source device,” as recited in claim 1 of the present application. The combination also would not disclose or suggest authenticating a “video sink device to the first video repeater device,” as claim 1 also recites. Claim 12 recites similar features. The Office Action therefore fails to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claim 1 or claim 12.

In addition, this response amends claim 1 to recite that authentication of the video repeater device involves “said first video repeater device identifying itself as a repeater device to said video source device.” Even if Yamauchi and Vijeh were to be combined, the combination would not disclose or suggest that operation.

All other rejected claims depend ultimately from claim 1 or claim 12. For the foregoing reasons and other reasons, claims 1-27 are all in condition for allowance.

**Information Disclosure Statements:**

The Office Action included copies of many Information Disclosure Statements (IDSs) with initials to confirm consideration by the Examiner. Applicants appreciate such consideration. The Office Action did not include a copy of the IDSs submitted on December 12, 2000. The Office Action also did not include a copy of the IDS submitted on February 8, 2001. Copies of those IDSs and associated postcard receipts stamped by the U.S.P.T.O. are enclosed for reference. Applicants respectfully request copies of those IDSs with the references initialed to confirm consideration by the Examiner.

**Conclusion:**

Applicants respectfully request approval and entry of the enclosed replacement drawing sheets, entry of the claim amendments, confirmation of consideration of the enclosed IDSs, and prompt issuance of Notice of Allowance.

If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (512) 732-3927.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 9/28/04

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael R. Barré  
Patent Attorney  
Intel Americas, Inc.  
Registration No. 44,023  
(512) 732-3927

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor &  
Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

9-28-04

Date of Deposit

Kristin A. Morrow  
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence  
Kristin A. Morrow 9-28-04  
Signature Date